

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 12, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 8, 15, and 17 have been amended and claims 2, 11, 16, and 19-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 15, and 17 have been amended to clarify that the destination telephone number is imported from a first database external to the server, the call request is transmitted from a non-secure data network to a telecommunications network via a secure Internet Protocol network, the first database external to the server is in communication with the non-secure data network, and the server is in communication with a second database, the second database having stored therein the call request, the call request comprising an Internet Protocol address of the Internet-enabled device. Support for these amendments may be found in Figure 2 and on page 9, line 3 through page 12, line 19 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener (US 6,324,264) in view of Lamb et al. (US 6,747,970, hereinafter "Lamb"). Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grunsted (US 6,129,123) in view of Bannister (US 6,430,282). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiener and Lamb and further in view of Grunsted.

Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between Applicants representative Alton Hornsby III (Registration No. 47,299) and the Examiner was held on October 19, 2006 to discuss a proposed amendment to independent claim 1 in view of the cited references Wiener and Lamb. In the interview, the Applicants' representative pointed out that the combination of Wiener and Lamb

failed to disclose a secure Internet Protocol network (such as a secure intranet) which connects a non-secure network to a telecommunications network, which was recited in the proposed amendment to claim 1. In particular, it was pointed out that Lamb only discloses a PSTN, which is alleged in the Office Action to be a secure network, and that a PSTN is not a secure Internet Protocol network. It was further pointed out that Wiener discloses two networks, one of which is a PSTN, but does not disclose a secure Internet Protocol network. It was further pointed out that the firewall attributed to the disclosure of Lamb in the Office Action is not a network. A discussion was also had with respect to additional features recited in the proposed amendment to claim 1 including the recitation of a call request comprising an Internet Protocol address of an Internet-enabled device. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment to claim 1 was sufficient to overcome the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-14 and 18-19

Claims 1-14 and 18-19 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wiener in view of Lamb. As noted above, claims 2, 11, and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies an apparatus for allowing a calling party to initiate a telephone call from an Internet-enabled device. The apparatus includes a server operative for receiving an originating telephone number and a destination telephone number in response to a command from the Internet-enabled device, wherein at least the destination telephone number is imported from a first database external to the server, generating a call request, and transmitting the request from a non-secure data network to a telecommunications

network via a secure Internet Protocol network to request the telecommunications network to establish a connection between the originating telephone number and the destination telephone number, wherein the first database external to the server is in communication with the non-secure data network and wherein the server is further in communication with a second database, the second database having stored therein the call request, the call request comprising an Internet Protocol address of the Internet-enabled device.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Wiener and Lamb fails to teach disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose transmitting a call request from a non-secure data network to a telecommunications network via a secure Internet Protocol network to request the telecommunications network to establish a connection between the originating telephone number and the destination telephone number or that the call request comprises an Internet Protocol address of an Internet-enabled device.

Wiener discusses a method of establishing a communications call via the Internet (a non-secure network) to a PSTN (see Figure 1). User interfaces are provided for selecting a party, making a call request which includes a destination telephone number for calling the selected party, and for entering an originating number (see Figures 5 and 6). Wiener, however, fails to disclose transmitting a call request from a non-secure network to a secure Internet Protocol network and then to a telecommunications network. Wiener also fails to disclose a call request which includes an Internet Protocol address.

Lamb, relied upon for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Wiener, discusses a user agent that a user may access via a user agent interface to request that a call may be established (see Figure 4). In the Office Action it is alleged that Lamb teaches a firewall (telecom network server

202-1 in Figure 3) between two networks (i.e., the Internet and a PSTN). However, as noted in the telephonic interview of October 19, a firewall is not a network and thus Lamb fails to disclose a secure Internet Protocol network for transmitting a call request from a non-secure network to a telecommunications network. Additionally, Lamb, like Wiener, also fails to disclose a call request which includes an Internet Protocol address.

Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Wiener and Lamb and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 3-6 depend from amended independent claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3-6 should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 7 and 18 recite similar features as amended independent claim 1, and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 8-10 and 12-14 depend from amended independent claim 7, and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 15-17

Claims 15-17 are rejected as being unpatentable over Grunsted in view of Bannister. As noted above, claim 16 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer thus rendering the rejection of this claim moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 15 specifies a computer readable medium containing instructions that when executed by a computer perform acts for allowing a calling party to initiate a telephone call from an Internet-enabled device. The acts include receiving a request from the Internet-enabled device of a non-secure network at a server of a secure Internet Protocol network to initiate the telephone call; receiving an originating telephone number; receiving a destination telephone number by a user of the Internet-enabled device providing a personal identification number after having accessed the server that allows access to a telephone directory

database of the secure Internet Protocol network and receiving a selection of the destination number from the telephone directory via the Internet-enabled device; and transmitting a call request containing the originating telephone number and the destination telephone number to a telecommunications network via the secure Internet Protocol network to request the network to establish a connection between the originating telephone number and the destination telephone number, wherein the server is in communication with a database for storing the call request, the call request comprising an Internet Protocol address of the Internet-enabled device.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Grunsted and Bannister fails to teach disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended independent claim 15. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose transmitting a call request to a telecommunications network via a secure Internet Protocol network to request the telecommunications network to establish a connection between the originating telephone number and the destination telephone number or that the call request comprises an Internet Protocol address of an Internet-enabled device.

Grunsted discusses initiating telephone calls using a data network in which call requests (including an account number and a destination telephone number) are received via a web page and sent over the Internet to a PSTN (see Figures 1-4). Bannister discusses originating voice calls between two voice terminals (e.g., telephones) using a data terminal and a data service node connected to the Internet. The data service node (which includes an Internet interface) may transmit call requests (which include a telephone number) to a telecommunications switch. See Figures 1-3 and col. 5, line 40 through col. 6, line 33. Neither Grunsted nor Bannister however, alone or in combination, discloses a secure Internet Protocol network utilized to establish a

connection with a telecommunications network or a call request comprising an Internet Protocol address of an Internet-enabled device.

Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Grunsted and Bannister and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claim 17 depends from amended independent claim 15, and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claim 17 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 20

Claim 20 is rejected as being unpatentable over Wiener and Lamb and further in view of Grunsted. As noted above, claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer thus rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

The present amendment is being filed with a petition and payment for a one-month extension of time. Please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: November 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748